

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled. Claim 6 has been amended in independent form to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Claim 7 has been cancelled. Additionally Claims 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18 have been amended in independent form to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 1. Claim 19 has been cancelled.

Claims 6-10 currently stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,453,108 to Isaksson et al. in view of U.S. 5,944,859 to Lippert et al. Claim 6 as currently amended calls for a hot gas filtration apparatus comprising candle filter elements having a porous body disposed within a vessel. A catalytic layer is disposed on the surface of the porous body and a porous membrane is positioned on the outer surface of the porous body, including a second catalytic layer. Neither Isaksson et al. or Lippert et al. disclose a filter element employing two separate distinct catalytic layers. Accordingly, Claim 6 should not rightfully be considered obvious in view of the combined teachings of Isaksson et al. and Lippert et al.

Claim 8 is amended and is dependent upon Claim 6 and calls for a porous membrane positioned on the inner surface of the porous body wherein the membrane includes a third catalytic layer. Claim 9 is dependent upon Claim 8 and states that the second and third catalytic layers include different catalysts. Claim 10 is dependent upon Claim 6 and calls for a porous membrane positioned on the inner surface of the porous body containing a second catalytic layer. Neither of the features added by Claims 8 through 10 are either described, taught or shown in either Isaksson et al. or Lippert et al. Accordingly, Claims 8 through 10 should similarly be allowable.

The Office Action indicated that Claims 13-18 were only objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that these claims would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 13-18 have been so amended and, therefore, should now be allowable. Claim 19 has been cancelled.

Accordingly, applicants have shown wherein Claim 6, 8-10 and 13-18 distinguish over the references and should now be allowable. Accordingly reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel C. Abeles
Reg. No. 25,822
Attorney for Applicant
412.566.1295